

## REMARKS

Claims 5, 11-12, 17 and 27 were previously cancelled. Hence, Claims 1-4, 6-10, 13-16, 18-26 and 28-30 are pending in this application.

### I. SUMMARY OF THE TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

Examiner El Chanti is thanked for conducting a telephone interview with applicants' representatives Christopher J. Palermo and Malgorzata A. Kulczycka on December 7, 2010.

Claim 1 and amendments to Claim 1 were discussed. Claim 1 recites, among other features, automatic reconfiguration of the AAA server based on a forwarded requests and requests from one or more other access devices. At the conclusion of the interview, the Examiner agreed that Claim 1, as amended, distinguishes over the art of record and that the claims would be allowable.

### II. ISSUES NOT RELATING TO PRIOR ART

#### A. CLAIMS 13-16 AND 18 -- 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 13-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. (Office Action, pages 3-4) This is incorrect. Independent Claim 13 recites "one or more processors" as well as a network interface and a computer-readable medium. A processor combined with the other elements defines a machine for the purpose of determining statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Therefore, Claim 13 is directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 14-16 and 18 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 13 and thus, by virtue of their dependence from Claim 1 that is directed to a statutory subject matter, Claims 14-16 and 18 are also directed to a statutory subject matter. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### B. CLAIMS 11-12 -- 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite. (Office Action; page 2) Claims 11-12 are cancelled rendering the rejection moot.

### III. ISSUES RELATING TO ALLEGED PRIOR ART

#### A. CLAIMS 1-4, 6-16 AND 18-30 — 35 U.S.C. § 103(e): PFITZNER, AMIN

Claims 1-4, 6-16 and 18-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Pfitzner et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,506,069 (“Pfitzner”) in view of Amin et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,854,014 (“Amin”). (Office Action, page 4) This rejection is respectfully traversed.

#### CLAIM 1

Support for the amendment is provided at least at least paragraphs [25]-[27] and [05] of the applicants’ specification.

During the interview, Claim 1, as amended herein, was discussed. At the conclusion of the interview, the Examiner agreed that Claim 1, as amended, distinguishes over the art of record. The art of record does not recite one or more particular claim features. For example, the art of record fails to disclose that the authentication, authorization and access-control server is automatically reconfigured in real time based on the forwarded authentication, authorization and access request and one or more of the requests from one or more other access devices that are attached to the computer network and services that are required by the one or more other access devices.

Therefore, at least for the reasons described above, Claim 1 is patentable over the art of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### CLAIMS 11, 13, 19 AND 23

Claim 11 was cancelled. Claims 13, 19 and 23 recite features similar to those in Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 13, 19 and 23 are patentable over Pfitzner and Amin, individually or in combination, for the same reasons as for Claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

#### B. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The claims that are not discussed above depend directly or indirectly on the claims that have been discussed. Therefore, those claims are patentable for the reasons given above. In

addition, each of the dependent claims separately introduces features that independently render the claim patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, and to expedite positive resolution of the examination, separate arguments are not provided for each of the dependent claims at this time.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. A petition for an extension of time is hereby made to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any applicable fee to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: December 21, 2010

/MalgorzataAKulczycka#50496/  
Malgorzata A. Kulczycka  
Reg. No. 50,496

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, California 95110  
Telephone: (408) 414-1228  
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076